

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated July 17, 2008. Claims 10, 17, 20-24, 28, 30-33 and 37-39 are now present in this case. By this amendment, claims 10, 21, 23, 28, 30, 32, and 39 have been amended, claims 4-8, 25, and 36 have been canceled, and no new claims have been added.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the September 3, 2008 and September 4, 2008 Examiner's Interviews. The claims submitted have been amended to be consistent with those discussions.

Rejection of Claims 4-8, 28, 30-33, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 4-8, 28, 30-33, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,606,491 issued to Peck combined with U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001-0036224 filed by Demello et al. Claims 4-8 have been canceled. Claims 28, 30-33, and 39 have been amended to depend from claim 10. Therefore, this ground for rejection has been rendered moot.

Rejection of Claims 10, 17, 20-25 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 10, 17, 20-25 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,310,889 issued to Parsons et al. in view of Peck and Demello et al. Claims 25 and 36 have been canceled.

As acknowledged in the Office Action, Parsons et al. does not teach a user identifier based on a SIM serial number, and unrelated to the device identifier. (Page 7, lines 14-17). For this element, the Office Action looks to Peck. As also acknowledged by the Office Action, Peck does not teach or suggest an anonymous user identifier that is unrelated to authentication information. (Page 8, lines 7-8). For this element, the Office Action looks to the Mediation Servers of Demello et al.

As mentioned in the previous amendment filed in the application, Peck is concerned with authentication to a network and not with the identification of a user to a content provider after authentication occurs. Thus, Peck is completely silent with

respect to passing an anonymous user identifier to a content provider. While Peck performs an authentication process, that process includes the SIM serial number.

Demello et al. teaches a system that uses subscriber location information to build a subscriber profile. The system includes a Mediation Server 19 that communicates with a Profiling Server 21. The Mediation Server 19 analyzes network event information to generate location detail records comprising an anonymous identifier and location positioning data. (page 6, paragraph 98). The anonymous identifier prevents the identification of wireless users in the location positioning data records outside the Mediation Server. (page 8, paragraph 125) Thus, the network does not receive an anonymous user identifier from the mobile station. Instead, the anonymous user identifier is assigned by the network.

How the anonymous identifier is generated is discussed at paragraph nos. 125 and 135 on pages 8 and 9, respectively. As explained in the reference, the anonymous identifier is generated as a function of “Mobile Identification Number (MIN) and/or other unique identifiers, including IMSI, MSISDN or Mobile IP.” (page 8, paragraph 125) As discussed in applicants previously filed amendment, the MIN, IMSI, and MSISDN are all security sensitive. Further, none of these values are a SIM-based ESN. In fact, the reference is silent with respect to a subscriber identity module (SIM) and SIM-based ESN.

The location detail records generated by the Mediation Server 19 are sent to the Profiling Server 21 for storage. The party operating the Profiling Server 21 does not give access right privileges to the party operating Mediation Server 19, and vice versa. (pages 6-7, paragraph 90). In this manner, user profile information is separated from user personal information, profiles being stored on the Profiling Server and personal information on the Mediation Server. (page 7, paragraph 92).

The anonymous identifier discussed in Demello et al. is used only (1) to collect profile data based on network events and (2) to push content to a class or group of wireless users based on certain profiling characteristics. Demello et al. does not teach the content providers receive the anonymous user identifier. Instead, the reference teaches the Mediation Server 19 forwards network event related information and a subscriber's anonymous identifier to the Profiling Server 21, which collects the

information and associates it the anonymous identifier. Then, a content provider may use the profiles stored on the Profiling Server 21 to push content along with one or more anonymous identifiers to the Mediation Server 19. (Abstract and pages 9-10, paragraphs 146-147). The Mediation Server 19 translates or decodes the user anonymous identifiers into MINs or any other appropriate mobile identifier, to direct messages that are generated by the Profiling Server 21 to the wireless users. (page 8, paragraph 125)

In summary, none of these references teaches the network receives an anonymous user identifier from a communication device, the anonymous user identifier being both associated with the SIM identification number and unrelated to authentication information. Therefore, even if one were to modify the communication device of Peck as suggested by the Office Action to transmit the anonymous identifier disclosed by Demello et al. (which is unrelated to the SIM identification number) and the AUTHR disclosed by Peck (which is derived from a SIM-based ESN and used during authentication as authentication information) one would not achieve the invention of independent claim 10, which recites a content provider comprising a content personalization interface configured to receive the anonymous user identifier associated with the SIM serial number and unrelated to both the device identifier and the authentication information.

The content provider of claim 10 also includes a processor configured to use the anonymous user identifier to personalize content for the at least one of the mobile stations, and to provide the personalized content to the at least one of the mobile stations. To further clarify claim 10, the claim has been amended to recite an authentication process performed by the network that excludes the anonymous user identifier and authenticates the mobile station with the network based on the authentication information received from the mobile station. As explained above, Parsons et al., Peck, and Demello et al. alone and in hypothetical combination fail to teach or suggest these elements. Therefore, applicants kindly request withdrawal of this ground for rejection of claim 10, and claims 17, 20, 28, 30-33, and 37-39 that depend from claim 10.

Amended independent claim 21 recites an authentication process based on the authentication information and not based on the anonymous user identifier authenticates the mobile station with the wireless communication network. After the mobile station is authenticated with the wireless communication network, the content provider receives an anonymous user identifier from the wireless device over the wireless communication network, the anonymous user identifier being based, at least in part, on the serial number and being unrelated to both the device identifier and the authentication information. The content provider selects content based on the anonymous user identifier and provides the selected content to the wireless device over the wireless communication network. As explained above, Parsons et al., Peck, and Demello et al. alone and in hypothetical combination fail to teach or suggest these elements. Therefore, applicants kindly request withdrawal of this ground for rejection of claim 21, and claims 22-24 that both depend from claim 21.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the subject application and its allowance are kindly requested. The applicant has made a good faith effort to place all claims in condition for allowance. If questions remain regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 757-8021.

Respectfully submitted,
Herman Chien
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
/Heather M. Colburn/

Heather M. Colburn
Reg. No. 50815

HMC/lkb

1201 Third Avenue
Suite 2200
Seattle, Washington 98101
Phone: (206) 757-8021
Fax: (206) 757-7021

11696356